THE WASHINGTON TREATY.

The American Case Before the Parliament of Great Britain.

THAT KIND OF A TREATY IS IT?

The Men of Both Countries Who Made It Criticised.

BUNGLING BUSINESS.

An Irish Member's Review of the Whole Affair.

GLADSTONE'S "GOD HELP US!"

Could at One Time Have Lumped the Job, but That Time is Past.

THE CONFEDERATE COTTON LOAN.

Tone of the English Press on the Subject.

LONDON, Feb. 10, 1872. The report upon the address to the Throne, in eply to the Queen's speech, being brought in the douse of Commons by Mr. Strutt, in the session of the 7th inst., Mr. Bernal Osborne, an Irish member, rose, and after referring to the Scotch Education II, the Ballot bill, the French Commercial Treats nd other matters, he came right down to the Ameri

Mr. Bernal Osborne's Speech.

Mr. Bernal Osborne's Speech.

Mr. Osborne said:—What is the position of this country at the present moment with regard to these caims growing out of the Alabama and several there questions? Why, proposity it is the most momentous that this Parliament has ever entertained. And it has appeared strange to me that, with a gendeman altting in this thouse who had a hand in making this treaty, we had no direct information whatever as to how this bunging Dusiness has been brought about. There seems to be a sort of conspiraly on both sites to let down these gentlemen, who have cost us an enormous sum of money, as easy as they can. But I would ask the thouse to consider for a moment if the business of any mercantile firm in the country were conducted on similar principles what would become of its business? Why, it would be in the Gazette to-morrow! We have heard something as to the construction of this treaty; but now had it all arise? The right honorable gentleman the First Minister of the Crown has taxen up a position which no other man in this country has ever yet taken up. He taixed of the energetic labors of the Migh Commissioners, and he maintained logically and grammatically that there was no ambiguity whatever in this treaty.

Almingury!

I do not profess to be as good a judge of phrases of ambiguity as the right honorable gentleman the First Minister of the Crown, but where there is a consentaneous agreement on the part of the whole press of the country that there is an ambiguity. I feel sare that not even the most bigoted followers of the city flight honorable gentleman, not even his greatest flatterers, will follow him in maintaining that there is no ambiguity whatever in this treaty, and there is no ambiguity whatever in this treaty.

What is the Dispute About?

there is no ambiguity whatever in this treaty, if there is no ambiguity whatever in this treaty. If there is no ambiguity whatever in this treaty, if there is no ambiguity whatever in this treaty. But I am for iffed on this point by an opinion as to the ambiguous nature of this treaty, which I will read to the House, and then I will give my authority. Speaking of this treaty, he says:—
"What is there in this treaty to prevent extravagant claims? I cannot find one single word in these protocois or in these rules which prevents such claims from being put in and taking their chance. As iar as the Alaoama claims are concerned, the treaty has been entered into most carelessly and inguardedly, and must inevitably lead to much inscussion hereafter in Parliament." That is the opinion of a late Lord Chancellor, speaking in another place last year. And yet, in the lace of his, we are told by the First Minister of the Crown that there is no ambiguity, and we are asked to pass away from the origin of this most disgraceful business to the government of this country—for I agree that it is a treaty the responsibility of which must rest entirely with the government. We need not go far to seek for the origin. What was the Constitution of the American High Con-

MISSION?

Sisted of five lawyers—the most experienced stute men in the United States. And whom and astute men in the United States. And whom it we send out to meet those inwjers? It was aid in another place by a noble lord that this treaty was the greatest siur on our diplomatic reputation hat could be conceived. I demur to that statement; it is no siur on our diplomatic character. The most experienced and distinguished diplo-

that could be conceived. I demur to that statement; it is no siur on our dipiomatic character. The most experienced and distinguished diplomatists of this country—men who had drawn reaties and were acquainted with international law—were at once set aside it favor of a band of the country—men who had drawn reaties and were acquainted with international law—were at once set aside it favor of a band of the country, who, nowever high their social position, and nowever distinguished in debate in this House, had no bort of knowledge—I do not say of international law, but of the drawing ap of treaties, unless, inneed, of this Americaa character. We are told of the energetic labors of this Commission, of the actinges which they made for an ungrateful country, and we have also nearl something of APRIVATE UNDERSTANDING between them and Mr. Fish that these claims were to be waived. Private understandings as to a diplomatic document! I do not understand such a pourse. I want to know why there was no public mention of these claims in the treaty, excutding them beyond an possibility of doubt. Why, actually, in the American case—which has only been, as we are given to understand, one week in the possession of the government, though a friend of mine has had it for four weeks—we find it expressly batted that our commissioners, as early as the State of March, were informed that these indirect claims would be put in. Was there any protest made? They may have protested over the table of Mr. Fish of at the social meetings in New York; but no process are assigned why these indirect claims should not be put in. I want to know what the energetic labors of these Commissioners have come to.

At Mrst they made a great mistake in not testening to the amicable settlement proposed by the American Dommission. Those are largers had no great wish to go to arout auton—though I doubt whether a roultration may not yet.

LEAD US INTO SEVERAL AWKWARD POSITIONS. I have reason to believe that they offered to take a tump sum for danages, direct and th

Commission. Those are dawyers had no great wish to go to arbitration—though I doubt whether arultration may not yet.

LEAD US 18770 SEVERAL AWKWARD POSITIONS. Inave reason to believe that they offered to take a lump sum for damages, direct and indirect; and that the "annicable settlement" which we hear of amounted to this, that they would have taken to,000,000 in satisfaction of all claims. What will they take now? Why, the long and the short of it is that these five astate American Commissioners fan round our Commissioners, who, with an ingenuity almost unparalleled in the traditions of the Foreign Office, have contrived to create an expost facto law to enable Great Britain to tax herself to pay claims which Her Majesty's government declare at the same time are neither just nor deserved. While, I we had sent out a shrewed practising attorney what money he might not have saved us. I understand that, independently of other expenses, the mere cost of reference by the electric cable—the punctuation of the periods which we heard of last might—amounted to a sum or between £28,000 and £30,000. I think no member of this House has any right to make pomplaths of the conduct of the American Commissioners; they were five shrewd, able lawyers, knowing what they wanted and now to set about it; they served their country well, and they have ganed a hiplomatic triumph. We have no reason to reflect but them; but we have great reason to look at home. WHAT IS OUR FUTURE POSITION?

That treaty leaves us at the mercy of a special tribunsi—a Board of foreign arbitrators—no doubt most distinguished jurisconsults, whatever that means, because I have heard these Commissioners of ours called distinguished jurisconsults, whatever them hears, because I have heard these Commissioners of ours called distinguished jurisconsults, whatever the means because I have heard these commissioners of ours called distinguished jurisconsults, whatever the beyond the First Minister—thungreds of militons? Why, the thing is ridiculous. There is only one co

and navies that cannot swim, has now tried its hand with treaties which will not stand.

Mr. Gladstore's Speech.

Mr. Gla Mr. Gladstone's Speech.

opportunity of considering with the best authority, and therefore the answer I give must be taxen for what it is worth; but

AS I BEAD THE ARTICLE OF THE TREATY
it is that no interest shall be paid from the time of presenting the claims, but that it does not at all touch the question of the discretion of the parties to include interest in the claims they make, or that of the discretion of the Commassioners to allow it if they think right. If that be so it is a mere executory provision, and one that does not now require from me a more elaborate notice. The honorable member expressed his regret that there was no reservation of the right of the flows of Commons to vote the money which the arbitrators might deciare us lable to pay, and he said the consequence of that would be that if the obligations of the treaty were not rulated a war might be the result. On that remark I am bound to say, first of all, that I think the issue would be pretty much the same either way. I don't say it would be a war, out, whatever it might be, it would be very much the same whether the reservation had been made in the treaty and the money then withheld, or whether it should be withheld duder the treaty as it now is.

THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AEE PERFECTLY AWARE

should be withheld under the treaty as it now is. THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT ARE PERPECTLY AWARE that we depend upon the discretion of this House in respect to the payment of the money; they have shown a disposition to trust to that discretion, and in that I beneve they are perfectly right. Although the honorable memoer was quite correct in saying that the House of Commons is the body which reality has the power of giving ultimate elect to this treaty in case the decision of the arbitrators should bewrite the power of giving ultimate elect to this treaty in case the decision of the arbitrators should be what I hope it may not be to find us habe to any payment from the national exchequer, yet it must be borne in mind that we have proceeded on the unit and perfect knowledge that this question of arbitration was not a new question. So far we have had this advantage, that, apart from the suject of the wording of the treaty—which is one of vast importance, but one entirely distinct—as to the object of the treaty, as to the principle of a reference of these claims to arbitration, we assumed, and had a right to assume, that we were already in possession of the judgment of Parliament, because this was not an unadvised act or the sociative government. Two treaties had already been concluded by this constry on this very subject and on the very same basis; and the discussions in this and the other House of Parliament enabled us to know that the country approved the general principle of a reference of these unfortunate differences to impartual arotration. The honorable gentleman said

statement whether he is in perfect possession of the meaning of the protocols which he has in his hands. He said he had heard with great astonishment my statement last night that we had undertaken to refer to arbitration the question of whether we should be held liable for the cost of that portion of the United States Navy which was employed in chasing these cruisers. I dare say many gentlemen heard that statement with astonishment, and I am very desirous of bringing it home to their minds; but that engagement was on the lace of the treaty and placed within the knowledge of Parliament during the last session. If the honorable gentleman will refer to the eighth page of the papers marked 0, 346, and containing the protocols of the negotiators of the Treaty of Washington, ne will find that a statement was submitted by the American Commissioners to the effect that they had sustained CERTAIN DIRECT AND ALSO CERTAIN INDIRECT LOSSES.

first, the capture and destruction of a large number of vessels, with their cargoes; second, the heavy national expenditure incurred in pursuit of these cruisers. He will then find that they recited the indirect losses, next that they waived the indirect losses in the hope of an amicable settlement. But with regard to direct losses there was no waiver whatever. There had been no protest made on our part, and, therefore, whether we think it convenient or inconvenient—although, of course, on this subject we shall be able to make on the whole of the case—yet this, I think, is a fair part of the matter to refer, and one which I take it by the treaty and the protocols together we are bound to allow to be referred.

THE BUNGLING BUSINESS.

referred.

THE BUNGLING BUSINESS.

Regarding what the memoer for Waterford remarked, he said:—This treaty has been a bungling business, and I thought he added—though I hope I was mistaken—that this was an "infamous docu-

Regarding what the member for Waterford remarked, he said:—This treaty has been a bungling business, and I thought he added—though I hope I was mistaken—that this was an "infamous document."

Mr. Bernal Osborne—I said it was a bungling business. ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.) Probably I also said it was "infamous."

The garden of my honorable friend's mind is far richer in flowers than mine; but he says there is ambiguity and more than ambiguity in this treaty, and that the American Commissioners on the said of March distinctly informed the British government that these indirect claims would be put in. Now, I wish to keep distinct in our discussions here two different questions—the one of them of vast and over wellming importance to this country, and the other also of great importance, but of importance as between Parliament and the existing administration. Whether there oe ambiguity in this document or not is a question worthy of the most careful attention, with a view to consider the conduct of the government; but I must take objection to a statement of my honorable friead (Mr. Osborne) that it was injurious to the interests of this country. When it is stated in this House it shall certainty not go villnout contradiction that on the 8th of March the American Commissioners informed the British Commissioners and government that these indirect claims would be put in. I say they informed them that the American government had incurred

HEAVY INDIRECT INJURY—
equivalent, it may not, to indemnification on their account in the event of no such settlement being made. Now there was here a distinct reservation of right. There is another clause. That is the protocol; that has the assent of both parties.

THERE ARE OTHER CLAUSES

with which I will not trouble the House now; but they must power hand, sustain our view of the mater. What we say is that this reservation of right was a reservation perfectly unequivocal, but confined to the case of whether an amicable settlement of all causes of difference between the two countri

Ar. Osborne—The amicable settlement was rejected.

A particular proposal that would have been an amicable settlement was rejected, but this treaty was concluded after the rejection of that particular proposal, and it was after that rejection that the Pleuipotentiaries of America said they were there for the purpose of making an amicable settlement, and they then set out the articles of the document by which that settlement was to be effected. My honorable iriend says, "Why not resort to direct negotiation?

SIX MILLIONS WOULD HAVE BEEN TAKEN

flation?

SIX MILLIONS WOULD HAVE BEEN TAKEN

if you in d done it in proper time. Now, indeed,
you can't get out of it so cheaply." Now, I believe
that six millions is somewhere within the power of
this country to pay, and perhaps a still larger sum;
but he entirely leadt over the preliminary unflegity.

recommend us to convess it now.

GOD HELF US!

Has my honorable friend thought for a moment of the position in which he proposes to place the country? When were these complaints made by America? In the year 1862 and in every subsequent year America has been contending—and I don't deny her right to contend—that we have failed in our international duty. In every one of those years, in every form and variety of representation and public act, we have not failed in odr international duty. A direct and diametrical difference of opinion and conviction has subsisted between the two governments. That dismetrically opposite conviction was tested by the most elaborate arguments perhaps of which the history of diplomacy anywhere contains the record. The character of

what is our contention in this controversy; it remains to be seen whether the American government agree to that or not; and their right to hold their own language and form their own opinion is as sacred as ours. My honorable iriend (Ar. Otway) says that the waole strength of our case depends on our maintaining that the treaty is ambiguous. I do not understand by what logical process he arrives at that conclusion. I admit that if it could be shown that there was some ambiguity in the treaty we should still be able to plead, if we could support it by reasonable evidence, the doctrine of intention. The doctrine of the meaning of the words is one thing; the doctrine of the intention of words is one thing; the doctrine of the intention of the parties is another. I stated distinctly last night that we adhered to the doctrine of the meaning of the words. We don't pronounce the doctrine of the intention of the parties. We shall give what we think is demonstrative evidence of the doctrine of the intention of the parties; but we shall appealand I hope distinctly and conclusively appealate the meaning of the words embodied in the instrument.

the intention of the parties; but we shall appeal—and I hope distinctly and conclusively appeal—to the meaning of the words embodied in the instrument.

THE COMPETENCY OF AN ARBITRATOR.

Only one other remark I would make. My honorable friend seems to suppose that every question respecting the competency of an arbitrator and as to the scope of an arbitration ought of necessity to be settled beforehand. That is not so. The ground on which Her Majesty's government proceed in fegard to the Treaty of Washington is not the mere ground that we think the indirect losses to be beyond the scope of the arbitration. I believe nothing to be more common in cases of arbitration than the raising of questions before the arbitration rests with the arbitrator himself the ground and decline to mean the earliest in point of time, but the earliest as compared with us—to have declared and acted, on an important former occasion, upon the right of one of the parties to withdraw from and decline to accept the result of arbitration. Well, we might have taken that course; but would it have been an honorable one? Very often it may be convenient to refer to the arbitrator himself the question of the scope of the reference; it is not worth while not to do so. We have at this moment certain questions pending in regard to ships in which the election of the simple question of the arbitration. It is not the simple question of the arbitration, that they are within the scope of the arbitration that has induced us to act as as we have done, but that questions are within the scope of the arbitration that has produced in the past few

OPINIONS OF THE ENGLISH PRESS ON THE AMERICAN DIFFICULTY.

The London Times of the 8th regards the previous day's discussion as of the sin regards the previous day's discussion as of the highest value, and for two reasons. "It showed a unanimity of opinion in the House of Commons in repudiating the admissibility of indirect damages in the reference to arbitration under the Treaty of Washington, and it enabled Mr. Gladstone to explain and qualify the untenable position he had assumed to the single processing the statement of the single process. Gladstone to explain and qualify the untenable po-sition he had assumed on Tuesday. The night's in-terval had brought with it opportunities of reflection on what he had been tempted to say on the previous evening, and he spoke in a far more guarded and cautious strain than

willing to admit that there was any defect or want

candidly admit we do not share the confidence of Mr. Gladstone), we can then fall back on an argument less complimentary to our sagacity, it is true, but not on that account the less convincing. We must confess that what we did mean we did not express intelligably, and deel ne to entertain the indirect claims on the ground of error in drawing up the terms of the treaty. We must show that this country and the United States did not agree addem, and that therefore the consensus, which is a necessary element of a valid contract, was wanting. The London Standard remarks that "Mr. Gladstone cuts off the chance of good understanding by deciaring that there can be no question about the interpretation of the treaty, and by representing its language as free from the slightest ambiguity. Forced into a corner by these declarations what can the American government do? To withdraw the demand for these indirect damages would be to allow, siter Mr. Gladstone's speeches, that it had made a claim under an arottration for which the terms of the submission did not furnish the silghtest pretence. But is it so clear that treaty was ambiguous, and that it was impossible to say that the words employed—words of American origin—did not establish some pretence for the claim. In the view we take of the matter this point is comparatively unimportant new. It only shows now awkwardy the government managed the business, and we can have no difficulty in agreeing with Mr. Bernai Osborne and Mr. Goborne morgan that Mr. Bernai Osborne and Mr. Goldney would have made a much more intelligible and satisfactory bargain. But what we have to concern ourselves about now is how to treat the American demands; and we hold the opinion that, while absolutely refusing to entertain them, we need not suggest that they were dishonestly made. But that is practically what Mr. Gladstone has done, and much as we sympathize with and applicant the decisive language in which he decisives it to be impossible for England to entertain such, or allow them to be entertained by any tribunal whose authority we admit, we are compelled to consider, with so many of his censors yesterday, that his language has been induscret, and will probably he

e of Commons, or that has been heard there generation. On other occasions he has spoken the force of individual character and convicting the second of the property and railied it in defeat. Yesterday he for England. The unanimous sent and purpose of the nation found by utterance in his voice. The condition of the second of the criticisms skilfully urged by Mr. Otway, shornes and Mr. Osborne Morgan we are distincted to agree. It was a fault to allow ambiguous second of the intrusion of the intrusion of the second of the intrusion of the i posed to agr

claims which had been unequivocally abundoned. But in substance Mr. Gladstone's speech was consistent in substance Mr. Gladstone's speech was consistent in substance Mr. Gladstone's speech was consistent in the possibility of doubtful interpretations. His stand upon the amingful of the kresty, or to admit the possibility of doubtful interpretations. His speech yesterday justined his condence, and will strengthen that of the nation."

The Loudon Tekep days remarks that "nothing is more essential for Engiand, just at this juncture, thus that her people should keep a firm and dignified refn upon their temper. We know perfectly well that all the bluster of all the United States journals put together will not affect our determination never to atimit the indirect claims even to decaste. Let the nauce by what it may, on this point there can be exception of party or class. We believe tiat, when our unyselding firmness snall have been fully recognized, our transatiantic kinsfolk will adopt calmer modes of expression and a more judicially equable tone in discussing a matter of grave political moment. We are condident that no echo of the strong language employed beyond the Atlantic will be sent back from our shores, and we have too muon trust in the genuine unfrendimes and good sense of the Americans to imagine that the 'tall talk' oil republic will be sent back from our shores, and we have too muon trust in the genuine unfrendimes and good sense of the Americans to imagine that the 'tall talk' oil republic will be sent back from our shores, and we have too muon trust in the genuine unfrendimes and good sense of the Americans to imagine that the 'tall talk' oil republic will be sent back from our shores, and we have too muon trust in the genuine and the lives of the propect of the United States in the Hondon Morning Advertiser observes:—"The Massierial journals have already dexpentated upon the necessity of all parties being united in paritotic resistance to the clammat of the propect of war. It is a desperate card, but i

The Loudon Economist says:—"The sensitive imagination of some persons on the stock Sxchange has assumed that the probable failure of the Alabama arbitration will probably lead to war between this country and America. But this is absurd. There is no casus belift in the question, and the real evil is quite great enough without being at all exaggerated. What really is to be feared is that the arbitration will 'go of;' that America will say it did so because the English were afraid of high damages, and would not submit the true question to the Court; that England will say we could not go on because the Americans tried to cheaf us, and to get us to submit questions which we never agreed to submit. Nother nation will hear the other stue; and both nations, who were to nave been made good irrends by this arbi-

The London Saturday Review romarks:—"There was probably not a single Englishman who suspected that the American statement of claims would include a demand for the cist of the pretended prolongation of the war. Even travellers and residents in the United States shared in the universal belief that the controversy was practically settled. Excessive confidence in the justice and good faith of the American government may have been a proof of weakness; nor was there any reason why the meaning which was attacaed by the English Commissioners to the treaty should not have been distinctly expressed. The vehemence which the American papers now denounce as unseemly represents a natural reaction, but it is idle to revive the fabulous statement that the treaty was a statesmanlike example of mutual concession."

The London Speciator observes that "all the great concessions were made on our part out of the abundance of our wish to satisfy the American America and because we supposed that in return America had waived the one class of demands too

America had waived the oue class of aemands too absurd in themselves and too preposterous in their magnitude for us ever to tains of referring them to the decision of others. Well might mr. Gladstone say, and heartily will the nation support him in his assertion, that the government reserves to itself the right to fall back on the 'piea that a man or a nation must be taken to be insane, if supposed to admit in a peaceful arottration claims of this character, which not even the last extremites of war and the lowest depths of misfortune would force a people with a spark of spirit—with the hundredth part of the traditions or the courage of the people of this country—to submit to at the point of death. The statesmen of the United States may assume that these words represent the absolutely unanimous rethese words represent the absolutely unanimous re-solve of the people of England. If the decision of the Washinngton Cabinet is correctly reported, the Treaty of Washington is already at an end,"

LOUIS NAPOLEON

A Voice from Chiselburs!-The Imperial Exile Addresses an Old Friend-The Disasters of Frauce-The Imperial Constitution Criticised-The Error of the Empire-The Aspirations of the Age.
The following letter from Napoleon III. to Baron

oguet has appeared in a Prague newspaper:-MY DEAR BARON—I thank you for the sincere expression of sympathy you have been pleased to send me at New Year's and the wishes you express for the future of my family, which may undoubtedly count you smoon its oldest and

THE CATACAZY CASE AGAIN.

More About the Catacasy Quarrel-The Er-An Emperor Feels About the American Treatment of the Question-The Perkins Claims-Tone of the Bussian Press.

me as haughty airs as did our own in President in peremptorily (as they put it) decim the invitation to return to Washington sent to at St. Louis. They maintain that this invitation in-stead of being an evidence of friendly sentiments on obliged by public opinion to make amends for hi shabby treatment of the Grand Duke at Washin and that no credit can be accorded him for an reparation which he was compelled to make.

BORE ABOUT TWO EVENTS. The Russians, as I have before stated, feel exceed-ingly sore, not only over the Catacazy negotiations but also over the reception of the Grand Duke as Wasnington, and they feel especially hurt by the unfriendly attitude of General Grant, from consideration, not to say gratitude, for the friend ship and sympathy shown us during our war think they have very good cause to look upon Grant as being rather more than impolite, not to much the friendly attitude of Russia in Europ aided the march of his own armies to victory Many of our officers, who had been fighting for weeks around Vicksburg, tired and ragged and hungry and discouraged, will remember, as himself ought to remember, with what delight that halled the arrival of a delegation of Russian officers

FULL OF SYMPATHY AND ADMIRATION for the armies of the North. It was not soldiers we eeded thea, nor arms, nor the sinews of war; w had all these things in sufficient quantity; but sym pathy and friendship, the knowledge that some ernment that understood the cause for which w RUSSIA'S POSITION DURING THE AMERICAN CIVIL

WAR.
And these expressions of sympathy were not, a
is too often the case, a mere meaningless array of
words without signification or importance, for the
rendered us most material aid and assistance. may no. be generally known that it was by the direct command of the Emperor that Gottsonakod informed the governments of France and England, when they were meditating interference in our affairs, that if they attempted it he would not quietly look on. It was not a simple case of repro-

affairs, that if they attempted it he would a quiety look on. It was not a simple case of repsentations or persuasions or diplomatic institutations or persuasions or diplomatic institutations or persuasions or diplomatic institutation that they tive, straightforward declaration that the this should not be done.

THE EMPEROR'S REQUEST.

Now President Grant and Secretary Fisn must be known this, and they ought to have been the first remember it; yet when the Emperor, as a personal vor, asked that Catacagy be allowed to remain us after the visit of the Grand Duke, Fish answered a first despatch granting the request, but not eventuoung the Emperor's name. This was look upon either as an intentional offence or an inexonable example of negligence or ignorance, who amounted to the same thing; and had Mr. Curresented the despatch as it was originally word it would not have been received. He, however changed the reading of it so as to make it accelled by putting in the name of the Emperor; mu to their astonishment, for by some means the generally knew not only the nature of the great part of the despatches that were exchanged about they did the proceeded in doing this it would be did to imagine, but it appears they did it by someans or other, and they were greatly supprished the first and they were greatly supprished for the despatch in the despatch mits thered form.

tered form.

WAS IT AN ERROR?

Had this error—not to call it by a harsher name—not been repaired, in some measure by the ready good sense of Mr. Curtin, the consequences might have been a complete cessation of diplomatic relations and no end of trouble and bad blood. Thus offence, owing to the induence of Mr. Curtin, might still have been forgiven had the SUBSEQUENT CONDUCT of the members of the government with regard to the Grand Duke been such as to make apparent the existence of friendly sentiments towards the Emperor and something like remembrance for his ad-

MY DARA BANOT- Hank you for the sucretary results of sympasty you have been pleased to send you have been pleased you have you